



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/409,748 | 10/01/1999 | DANIEL SCHUTZER | CITI0127 | 5805 |

27510 7590 04/01/2004
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14TH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2172

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

20

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/409,748

Applicant(s)

SCHUTZER, DANIEL

Examiner

HUNG Q PHAM

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 9-11 as in page 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 5, 7 and 13-14 on page 7 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As argued by applicant:

Claim 5 as previously amended, clearly indicates that the at least one Web page is from a plurality of Web pages whose links are received from the search of a search term. Thus, each of the plurality of Web pages is; complete, and at least one of the Web pages as claimed, i.e., one of the search results and not the hit list of the search results, is copied to an email. Thus, the same reasons set forth above for the allowability of claims 1 and 9-11 also apply here as well.

As disclosed in Navin-Chandra FIG. 2, a query is sent to MSE 262, and MSE 262 subsequently forwards query to the respective search engines. Each search engine SE then compiles a respective list of hits and sends the list to MSE 262 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, line 30-Col. 7, line 12). A hit is associated with a URL of an information resource (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 15-17). Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will access and recover the entire text or multimedia data associated with a hit (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 12-19) to determine which hit is pertinent to the query (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 20-23). The full texts of those designated documents or other textual item through the step of determining are then downloaded to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 23-30) for ranking and summarizing (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 30-33; Col. 8, lines 5-8) by utilizing respective Uniform Resource Location address (Navin-Chandra, Col. 12, lines 62-64). In summary, the system and method of

Art Unit: 2172

the present invention operate as follows: submit a query to the metasearch engine 262 that sends the query request to respective search engines that access a variety of information resources. The results are collected by the metasearch engine 262 and examined. Particular documents are slated for downloading and local storage in the computer 260. The new ranking and summarization are then performed (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 34-43). The results may be transmitted through an alternate mode module 208, which is the user's specified mode of transmission. For example, the results may be converted into a facsimile, e-mail or other document format specified by the user and transmitted to the location specified by the user (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7). As seen, the results of MSE 262 includes not only the hits represented by URLs, but also the slated documents, which have an entire text and associated multimedia data or *Web page* are converted into email. And by converting into email, obviously, the document as discussed or an entire web page is bundled into an email message.

In addition, if the result includes only URLs is copied to an email as argued by applicant, and if this assertion is right. The Navin-Chandra technique still renders obvious the step of bundling the Web page into the email, because the document or web page as a subset of the results that may be converted into email as well.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4, 8 and 12 on page 8 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As argued by applicant:

As stated in a previous Amendment, claims 4, 8 and 12 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above for the allowability of claims 3, 5, 7, 13 and 14. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, Mantha et al. discloses coping a web page to the client local storage (e.g., client 13C hard drive).

Thus, there is no obvious reason to bundle the copied web page in an email message for sending to the client.

For the same reason as in claims 3, 5, 7 and 13-14 with respect to the step of copying or bundling a copy of Web page, claims 4, 8 and 12 are unpatentable over Navin-Chandra as discussed above.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Adams teaches the technique of searching a sub link of a Web page, and the links with their network addresses are classified into a folder. Attaching a file into an email is a conventional method, and a folder that contains a plurality of sub links could be attached to an email. And by doing this with the Navin-Chandra technique, a user could retrieve directly a linked Web page via the search result rather than following the links.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2172

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussey [USP 6,230,156 B1] in view of Harvey [Internet Explorer 4 for Windows for Dummies Quick Reference].

Regarding to claim 1, Hussey teaches a method of processing user requests clients to submit requests to a server via electronic mail, the results of which are typically viewed at a later time (Hussey, Col. 3, lines 33-63). As shown in FIG. 3 is an Email message with a query (Hussey, Col. 8, line 19-Col. 9, line 43). As shown in FIG. 2, the email interface 30 is configured to periodically logon to the email system 20 in order to check the electronic mail box of the server to read all of the email messages currently stored in the email account for the server (Hussey, Col. 6, lines 35-40), the message is interpreted and converted into a proper request format (Col. 7, lines 8-15) as the step of *receiving at least one search term via e-mail*. As shown in FIG. 7, after checking the Email for validity, the query in the mail is submitted for processing in order to return a result at step 210 and 214 (Hussey, FIG. 7) as the step of *issuing a search request to a search engine using the at least one search term*. The result also is formatted at step 214 as the step of *receiving the hit list from the search engine* (Hussey, FIG. 7). A response email message is generated and sent back to originator at steps 216 and 220 as the step of *forwarding the e-mail message to an end-user's terminal*. Hussey does not explicitly disclose the steps of *retrieving at least one Web page from the hit list; bundling a*

copy of the at least one Web page into an e-mail message; and the copy of the at least one Web page may be reviewed by the end-user. Harvey teaches a method for searching the Web, composing and reading E-mail with Outlook Express (pages 112-114; 144-176). In order to search the Internet for information, a search string is entered (page 111), then clicking the **Search** button or pressing **Enter** to have the search engine begin searching (page 111). When the search engine finishes processing the searching, it returns a list of hyperlinks and user can click any of the hyperlinks in the list to display that Web page (page 112) as *retrieving at least one Web page based on the hit list*. To include a Web page in a new e-mail message, a user can click the **Mail** button and then choose **Send Page** from the pop-up menu (Including a Web page in an Outlook Express e-mail message, pages 150-151). To send the e-mail message with the Web page to the recipients, click the **Send Message**. As soon as the recipients of the message open it up, they have immediate access to the Web page, including all of its hyperlinks, right within the body of message (page 152). This indicates the steps of *bundling a copy of the at least one Web page into an e-mail message; and the copy of the at least one Web page may be reviewed by the end-user*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the two methods, requesting a search via email as taught by Hussey, and receiving a result Web page via email as taught by Harvey in order to reduce the surfing time for a particular information in the Internet.

Regarding to claim 9, Hussey and Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but does not explicitly disclose: *the copy of the at least one Web*

page bundled in the e-mail message may be reviewed by the end-user when the end-user's terminal is not connected to the Web. However, by using conventional email software such as outlook, after downloading a message, the messages are in the computer. This indicates the e-mail message is just an ordinary file in the file system. Thus it can be opened and reviewed by user when the user's terminal is not connected to the Web. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hussey and Harvey method to include the technique of reviewing the e-mail message when not connecting to the Web in order to review a Web page in the body of the message.

Regarding to claim 10, Hussey and Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Harvey further discloses: *the bundled at least one Web page includes a link to a non-retrieved Web page, wherein the non-retrieved Web page can be retrieved directly via connection to the Internet* (Harvey, page 152).

Regarding to claim 11, Hussey and Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, but fails to disclose *the non-retrieved Web page can be retrieved upon receiving another search term and issuing another search request to the search engine using the another term.* However, when following a link of a page to another Web page, a death link could be occurred because the page is closed temporarily for updating, and the page could be retrieved at another time by using another search term or a URL. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2172

time the invention was made to modify the Hussey and Harvey method to include the step of issuing another search request to the search engine using another term to retrieve a non-retrieved Web page in order to search a particular Web page in the WWW.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussey [USP 6,230,156 B1] in view of Harvey [Internet Explorer 4 for Windows for Dummies Quick Reference] and Adams et al. [USP 6,334,145 B1].

Regarding to claim 2, Hussey and Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose the step of *receiving a number representative of a depth in which the depth is the amount another Web page is removed from the at least one Web page; bundling a copy of each link between the other Web page and the at least one Web page into the e-mail message*. Adams teaches a method for efficiently retrieving data associated with linked network locations. As shown in Adams FIG. 7, a user could select the depth of sub links for searching and the result is placed into a folder as *receiving a number representative of a depth in which the depth is the amount another Web page is removed from the at least one Web page* (Adams, Col. 11, lines 10-44). The result folder of sub links could be bundled into email by attaching as disclosed by Harvey on pages 152-153. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra method by including the technique of searching a sub-plurality of Web page as taught by Adams, obviously,

Art Unit: 2172

the result folder of sub links could be converted into email by a conventional attaching technique, and by doing this, a user could retrieve directly a linked Web page via the search result rather than following the links. In addition the combination of Navin-Chandra and Adams technique could save a lot of surfing time in the Internet for a document that matches the search query.

6. Claims 3, 5, 7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navin-Chandra et al. [USP 6,275,820 B1].

Regarding to claim 3, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user submits a query to MSE 262. MSE 262 subsequently forwards the query to the respective search engines. Each SE then compiles a respective list and sends the list to MSE 262 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, line 30-Col. 7, line 12). Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will access and recover the entire text or multimedia data associated with a hit (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 12-19) to determine which hit is pertinent to the query (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 20-23). The hits are provided in the form of a cross reference to the location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated (Col. 7, lines 14-19). The full texts of those designated documents or other textual item through the step of determining are then downloaded to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 23-30) for ranking and summarizing (Col. 7, lines 30-33; Col. 8, lines 5-8) by utilizing respective Uniform Resource Location

Art Unit: 2172

address (Col. 12, lines 62-64). The technique as discussed above indicates the steps of *receiving an address associated with the at least one Web page*, and *retrieving the at least one Web page*. Navin-Chandra further discloses the step of *automatically forwarding the first e-mail message to a user's terminal*, which *may be retrieved and reviewed by the user* (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7 and Col. 13, lines 10-16). Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *automatically bundling a copy of the at least one Web page into the first e-mail message*. However, as disclosed by Navin-Chandra, by submitting a query to the metasearch engine 262 that sends the query request to respective search engines that access a variety of information resources, the results are collected by the metasearch engine 262 and examined. Particular documents are slated for downloading, and a new ranking and summarization are then performed (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 34-43). The results may be transmitted by a facsimile, or e-mail to the user's location (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7) for retrieving and reviewing (Navin-Chandra, Col. 13, lines 10-16). As seen, the result at MSE 262 includes not only the hits represented by URLs, but also the slated documents, which have an entire text and associated multimedia data or *entire Web pages*. And by converting the result into email, obviously, the document as discussed or an entire web page is converted as well for retrieving and reviewing at the user's terminal. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of automatically bundling the Web page into the email, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 5, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204 (Col. 6, lines 30-34). The query could be in batch mode, which contains the following information: (1) the query, (2) the particular information resources that should be contacted, (3) the time interval or periodicity in which to run the batch query, and (4) the performed mode of receiving the results (Col. 8, lines 44-53). This indicates the steps of *receiving at least one search term at the client terminal; bundling the at least one search term into a first message at the client terminal; forwarding the first message from the client terminal to the server*. After receiving the query, MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines (Col. 6, lines 34-39). This illustrates the step of *issuing the at least one search term as a search request from the server to a search engine*. After receiving the search term, each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C (Col. 6, lines 30-48). The hits are provided in the form of a cross reference to the location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated (Col. 7, lines 14-19). The result of hits then reported back to the MSE 262 (Col. 6, lines 49-56). This technique indicates the steps of *receiving links to a plurality of Web pages*

that are associated with the at least one search term at the server. Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will access and recover the entire text or multimedia data associated with a hit (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 12-19) to determine which hit is pertinent to the query (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 20-23). The full texts of those designated documents or other textual item through the step of determining are then downloaded to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 23-30) for ranking and summarizing (Col. 7, lines 30-33; Col. 8, lines 5-8). This technique performs the claimed *issuing a request for at least one of the plurality of Web pages; receiving the at least one Web page by the server.* Navin-Chandra further discloses *the server automatically forwarding the at least one e-mail message from the server to the client* (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7). Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *the server automatically copying the at least one Web page into at least one e-mail message by the server.* However, as disclosed by Navin-Chandra, by submitting a query to the metasearch engine 262 that sends the query request to respective search engines that access a variety of information resources, the results are collected by the metasearch engine 262 and examined. Particular documents are slated for downloading, and a new ranking and summarization are then performed (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 34-43). The results may be transmitted by a facsimile, or e-mail to the user's location (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7) for retrieving and reviewing (Navin-Chandra, Col. 13, lines 10-16). As seen, the result at MSE 262 includes not only the hits represented by URLs, but also the slated documents, which have an entire text and associated multimedia data or *Web pages*. And by converting the result into email, obviously, the document as discussed or an

Art Unit: 2172

entire web page is converted as well for retrieving and reviewing at the user's terminal. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of automatically copying the Web page into the email, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 7, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Navin-Chandra further discloses: *the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages* (Col. 5, lines 14-24, and Col. 2, lines 23-40).

Regarding to claim 13, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Navin-Chandra further discloses: *the server is an e-mail server* (FIG. 2, Col. 9, lines 1-7).

Regarding to claim 14, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Navin-Chandra further disclose *the server is connected to the Internet* (FIG. 2), but fails to disclose, *the client terminal is off-line with the Internet*, However, if a client connects with Internet by using a conventional technique such as dial up technique, obviously, the client will be off line some time during a day when not connecting. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra method to include the off line condition in order to have a searching system with dial up technique.

7. Claims 4, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navin-Chandra et al. [USP 6,275,820 B1] in view of Adams et al. [USP 6,334,145 B1].

Regarding to claim 4, Navin-Chandra teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, but fails to disclose: *generating the address based upon a request to review the at least one Web page that is linked to a copy of another Web page wherein the copy of the other Web page is bundled in a second e-mail message; and forwarding the second-email message to the user's terminal wherein the copy of the other Web page may be retrieved and reviewed by the user at the user's terminal*. Adams teaches a method for efficiently retrieving data associated with linked network locations. As shown in Adams FIG. 7, a user could select the depth of sub links for searching and the result is placed into a folder (Adams, Col. 11, lines 10-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra technique by including the steps of generating the address and forwarding the second email message as taught by Adams, and by doing this, a user could query the Internet at one time and off-line retrieve the search result at another time.

Regarding to claim 8, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-34). The query could be in batch mode, which contains the following information: (1) the query, (2) the particular information resources that should be contacted, (3) the time interval or periodicity in which to run the batch query, and (4) the performed mode of receiving the results (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 44-53). This indicates the steps of *receiving at least one search term at the client terminal; bundling the at least one search term into a first message at the client terminal; forwarding the first message from the client terminal to the server*. After receiving the query, MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 34-39). This illustrates the step of *issuing the at least one search term as a search request from the server to a search engine*. After receiving the search term, each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-48). The hits are provided in the form of a cross reference to the location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated (Col. 7, lines 14-19). Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will access and recover the entire text or multimedia data associated with a hit (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 12-19) to determine which hit is

Art Unit: 2172

pertinent to the query (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 20-23). The technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving links to a plurality of Web pages that are associated with the at least one search term at the server*. The full texts of those designated documents or other textual item through the step of determining are then downloaded to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 23-30) for ranking and summarizing (Col. 7, lines 30-33; Col. 8, lines 5-8) by utilizing respective Uniform Resource Location address (Col. 12, lines 62-64) as the steps of *issuing a request for at least one of the plurality of Web pages; receiving the at least one Web page by the server*. Navin-Chandra further discloses *the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages* (Col. 5, lines 14-24, and Col. 2, lines 23-40). Navin-Chandra further discloses the step of *forwarding the at least one e-mail message from the server to the client; wherein the at least one e-mail message comprises a plurality of e-mail messages* (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7). Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *copying the at least one Web page into at least one e-mail message by the server*, and *the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages; at least one of the sub-plurality of Web pages is copied into one of the plurality of e-mail messages*. However, as disclosed by Navin-Chandra, by submitting a query to the metasearch engine 262 that sends the query request to respective search engines that access a variety of information resources, the results are collected by the metasearch engine 262 and examined. Particular documents are slated for downloading, and a new ranking and summarization are then performed (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 34-43). The results may be transmitted by a facsimile, or e-mail to the user's location (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7) for retrieving

Art Unit: 2172

and reviewing (Navin-Chandra, Col. 13, lines 10-16). As seen, the result at MSE 262 includes not only the hits represented by URLs, but also the slated documents, which have an entire text and associated multimedia data or *Web pages*. And by converting the result into email, obviously, the document as discussed or web page is converted as well for retrieving and reviewing at the user's terminal.

Adams teaches a method for efficiently retrieving data associated with linked network locations. As shown in Adams FIG. 7, a user could select the depth of sub links for searching and the result is placed into a folder (Adams, Col. 11, lines 10-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra method by copying the Web page, and including the technique of searching a sub link of a Web page as taught by Adams, the result folder of sub links could be converted into email as well. By doing this, a user could retrieve directly a linked Web page via the search result rather than following the links, in addition, the combination of Navin-Chandra and Adams technique could save a lot of surfing time in the Internet for a document that matches the search query.

Regarding to claim 12, Navin-Chandra teaches a method and system for searching in the Internet (Navin-Chandra, Col. 1, lines 15-23). According to Navin-Chandra method, a user operating at computer 202 submits a query to MSE 262 via an ISP 204 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-34). The query could be in batch mode, which contains the following information: (1) the query, (2) the particular information resources

Art Unit: 2172

that should be contacted, (3) the time interval or periodicity in which to run the batch query, and (4) the performed mode of receiving the results (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 44-53). This indicates the steps of *receiving at least one search term*. After receiving the query, MSE 262 uses the query to determine which IRs to access. It then parses and reformats the query into formats appropriate for the respective search engines on computers 210, 220 and 230, e.g., MSE 262 subsequently forwards an appropriately formatted query to the respective search engines (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 34-39). This illustrates the step of *issuing a search request to a search engine using the at least one search term*. After receiving the search term, each SE then interrogates their respective indices of the associated IRs and compiles a respective list of hits with associated ranks and summaries as shown in FIGS. 2A, 2B and 2C (Navin-Chandra, Col. 6, lines 30-48). The hits are provided in the form of a cross reference to the location, i.e., a URL, of a particular IR to which the hit is associated (Col. 7, lines 14-19). The result of hits then reported back to the MSE 262 (Col. 6, lines 49-56) as the step of *receiving the hit list from the search engine*. Upon reception of the result lists, the MSE 262 will access and recover the entire text or multimedia data associated with a hit (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 12-19) to determine which hit is pertinent to the query (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 20-23). The full texts of those designated documents or other textual item through the step of determining are then downloaded to the computer 260 (Navin-Chandra, Col. 7, lines 23-30) for ranking and summarizing (Col. 7, lines 30-33; Col. 8, lines 5-8) by utilizing respective Uniform Resource Location address (Col. 12, lines 62-64) as the steps of *retrieving at least one Web page based on the hit list*. Navin-Chandra further

discloses the step of *forwarding the e-mail message to an end user's terminal to be reviewed by the end-user* (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7 and Col. 13, lines 10-16). Navin-Chandra does not explicitly teach the steps of *bundling a copy of the at least one Web page into an e-mail message; and the bundled at least one Web page includes a link to another retrieved Web page, wherein a copy of the another retrieved Web page is also bundled into the e-mail message*. However, as disclosed by Navin-Chandra, by submitting a query to the metasearch engine 262 that sends the query request to respective search engines that access a variety of information resources, the results are collected by the metasearch engine 262 and examined. Particular documents are slated for downloading, and a new ranking and summarization are then performed (Navin-Chandra, Col. 8, lines 34-43). The results may be transmitted by a facsimile, or e-mail to the user's location (Navin-Chandra, Col. 9, lines 1-7) for retrieving and reviewing (Navin-Chandra, Col. 13, lines 10-16). As seen, the result at MSE 262 includes not only the hits represented by URLs, but also the slated documents, which have an entire text and associated multimedia data or *Web pages*. And by converting the result into email, obviously, the document as discussed or an entire web page is converted as well for retrieving and reviewing at the user's terminal.

Adams teaches a method for efficiently retrieving data associated with linked network locations. As shown in Adams FIG. 7, a user could select the depth of sub links for searching and the result is placed into a folder (Adams, Col. 11, lines 10-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Navin-Chandra method by bundling a copy

Art Unit: 2172

or Web page, and including the technique of searching a sub link of a Web page as taught by Adams, the result folder of sub links could be converted into email as well. By doing this, a user could retrieve directly a linked Web page via the search result rather than following the links, and in addition, the combination of Navin-Chandra and Adams technique could save a lot of surfing time in the Internet for a document that matches the search query.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q PHAM whose telephone number is 703-605-4242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Hung Pham
March 29, 2004


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER